

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 713

UD 019 009

AUTHOR Gardner, Booker
TITLE The Implementation of IGE In Large Urban Systems:
Four Case Studies. Technical Report No. 406.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Research and Development
Center for Cognitive Learning.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 77
CONTRACT NE-C-00-3-0065
NOTE 38p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies (Education); Community Involvement;
Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary
Education; Financial Support; *Individualized
Instruction; Parent Participation; *Program
Descriptions; *Program Development; Program
Effectiveness; School Support; Teacher Participation;
*Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS California (Los Angeles); District of Columbia;
Illinois (Chicago); *Individually Guided Education;
New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

These four case studies document the Research and Development Center's involvement in the implementation of Individually Guided Education (IGE) in the Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and the District of Columbia school systems. Attention is focused on the results of the Center's efforts to ascertain the strategies and conditions required for implementing IGE in large urban systems and inner-city schools. Each case study describes initial contacts with the Center, internal conditions in the schools, internal conditions in the districts, and conditions in other educational agencies. The major factors that appear to influence the growth and development of IGE in large urban areas are summarized. These include: (1) availability of fiscal and personnel resources and financial stability of the school system; (2) the system's commitment and support; (3) stability and tenure of staff; (4) support of teacher organizations as well as parent/community groups; and (5) the cooperation of teacher education institutions. (Author/EB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED164713

Technical Report No. 406

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IGE IN LARGE URBAN
SYSTEMS: FOUR CASE STUDIES

by

Booker Gardner

Report from the
Implementation Project

Marvin J. Fruth
Principal Investigator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Wisconsin Research and Development
Center for Cognitive Learning
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

March 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wisconsin R&D
Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U D 019 009

Published by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by that agency should be inferred.

Center Contract No. NE-C-00-3-0065

WISCONSIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR COGNITIVE LEARNING

MISSION

The mission of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning is to help learners develop as rapidly and effectively as possible their potential as human beings and as contributing members of society. The R&D Center is striving to fulfill this goal by

- conducting research to discover more about how children learn
- developing improved instructional strategies, processes and materials for school administrators, teachers, and children, and
- offering assistance to educators and citizens which will help transfer the outcomes of research and development into practice

PROGRAM

The activities of the Wisconsin R&D Center are organized around one unifying theme, Individually Guided Education.

FUNDING

The Wisconsin R&D Center is supported with funds from the National Institute of Education; the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education; and the University of Wisconsin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	vii
I. Introduction	1
II. IGE in the Chicago Public Schools	3
Initial Contacts with the Center	3
Internal Conditions in the Schools	4
Internal Conditions in the Districts	8
Conditions in Other Educational Agencies	9
Concluding Comments	10
III. IGE in the Los Angeles Unified School District	13
Initial Contacts with the Center	13
Internal Conditions in the Schools	14
Internal Conditions in the Districts	15
Conditions in Other Educational Agencies	15
Concluding Comments	16
IV. IGE in the New York City Public Schools	17
Initial Contacts with the Center	17
Internal Conditions in the Schools	17
Internal Conditions in the Districts	19
Conditions in Other Educational Agencies	20
Concluding Comments	21
V. Staff Development Activities Conducted in the District of Columbia Public Schools	23
Initial Contacts with the Center	23
Internal Conditions in the Schools	24
Internal Conditions in the Districts	25
Conditions in Other Educational Agencies	26
Concluding Comments	26
VI. Summary and Conclusions	31
Reference	35

ABSTRACT

These four case studies attempt to document the Center's involvement in the implementation of IGE schools in four large urban systems: Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, and the District of Columbia. In these studies, attention is focused on the results of the Center's efforts to ascertain the strategies and conditions required for implementing IGE in large urban systems and inner-city schools. Each case study is divided into five sections: initial contacts with the Center, internal conditions in the schools, internal conditions in the districts, conditions in other educational agencies, and concluding comments.

Given the limited opportunity and success of the Center in working with large urban school systems over the past four years, considerable knowledge was gained for refining the strategy for urban implementation of IGE. Based upon our experiences, the major factors that appear to influence the growth and development of IGE in large urban areas are: (1) availability of fiscal and personnel resources and financial stability of the school system, (2) the system's commitment and support, (3) stability and tenure of staff, (4) support of teacher organizations as well as parent/community groups, and (5) the cooperation of teacher education institutions.

In the final analysis, it appears that any combination of these factors, plus some unanticipated consequences, tend to play a major role in whether or not IGE is established and continues to grow within these urban school systems. When these factors work in favor of innovation or change, IGE tends to flourish.

I

INTRODUCTION

As of the end of the 1976 school year, Individually Guided Education (IGE) will have been implemented in over 2,000 schools in 36 states. However, only three percent of these schools are in large urban systems and inner-city areas. Reflection on this condition led the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning (Center) to review the efforts that had been given to implementing IGE in urban systems, particularly inner-city schools, and to analyze the strategies that had been used successfully in implementing IGE in urban districts. In addition, the Center initiated investigations in selected urban and inner-city schools to determine strategies and conditions affecting IGE implementation (Walter & Gardner, 1975).

In these case studies attention is focused on the results of the Center's efforts to ascertain the strategies and conditions required for implementing IGE in large urban systems and inner-city schools. Each case study is divided into five sections: initial contacts with the Center, internal conditions in the schools, internal conditions in the districts, conditions in other educational agencies, and concluding comments.

For the purpose of these case studies, four urban systems where the Center has implemented IGE schools over the past five years were selected. Chicago and Los Angeles were selected because of past Center involvement in their successful implementation of IGE; whereas, New York City and the District of Columbia represent systems where technical assistance was only recently provided by the Center. Although IGE has been implemented in other urban systems, there is a lack of systematic data on its status.

Information available to the Center in September 1976 indicated that the number of IGE schools located in the selected urban systems were as follows:

<u>1976</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>
Chicago	12
Los Angeles	10
New York City	6
Washington, D.C.	0

II

IGE IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INITIAL CONTACTS WITH THE CENTER

In 1968, the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning established a School Advisory Committee which included an associate superintendent of the Chicago public schools as a member. Following the early meetings, the Center began to hold annual spring conferences with selected participants from around the country to expose them to IGE concepts and practices. In 1969, three principals from the Chicago Public School System attended the first conference, and subsequently other staff personnel from the system participated in these conferences.

Two years later, representatives from the Center were invited to make formal presentations on Individually Guided Education in Multiunit Schools (IGE/MUS) to a broader group of Chicago public school administrative and instructional staff. As a result of these contacts, personnel expressed an interest in using this model in the READ SCHOOLS--a select number of pilot demonstration schools using innovative and exemplary programs.

In the summer of 1972 after several months of exploration and negotiation, the Chicago Board of Education entered into a formal agreement with the Center to implement IGE and the multiunit school in two middle schools and four elementary pilot centers. The agreement called for the Center to provide the following services to the Chicago Board of Education:

1. Plan, staff, and operate a three-day IGE/MUS workshop for principals and key personnel of the six schools.
2. Prepare and provide to the BOARD a set of prototypic IGE/MUS staff development workshop agendas to assist the BOARD in planning pre-opening of school workshops.
3. Provide two days of consultant help to each of the six pilot centers at their pre-opening of school workshop.
4. Provide two one-day consultant visits to each of the six pilot centers to assist the principals and their staffs in the implementation of IGE/MUS.
5. Provide the audiovisual materials required for implementation of IGE/MUS for use in staff development workshops and in the six pre-opening of school workshops. Such materials are to be returned to the UNIVERSITY upon completion of the pre-opening of school workshops, unless purchased by the BOARD.
6. Provide assistance through telephone conferences as needed.

7. Establish a Chicago IGE/MUS Pilot Center Communications Network to facilitate exchange of information among the participating schools. This will consist of two newsletters prepared and distributed by the UNIVERSITY.
8. Ensure that the participating BOARD, principals, and unit leaders are invited to a national one-week Experienced Multiunit School Personnel Leadership Institute sponsored by the UNIVERSITY and a cooperating university, if this institute is held during the term of this AGREEMENT. There will be no registration fee for the persons representing IGE/MUS pilot centers. The UNIVERSITY will not provide travel and living expenses. The UNIVERSITY will inform the BOARD of the location and dates of said institutes.
9. Design procedures and instruments for appraising the progress of the IGE/MUS pilot centers' operations.
10. Secure base-line data and provide feedback during the four-month operation at such time and in such form as the evaluation design stipulates.

Although the state educational agency, the Illinois Office of Education (I.O.E.), had already signed an agreement with the Center to implement IGE in schools throughout the State of Illinois, I.O.E. was not involved in any Chicago public schools. Chicago took the initiative itself to contact the Center and contract with them directly to implement IGE in these six pilot schools.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE SCHOOLS

The six original pilot schools were located in six of the districts representing each of the three decentralized areas. Of these six, three were elementary schools, two middle schools, and one a magnet school. These schools represented various sections of the city and diverse ethnic populations; however, they were primarily concentrated in lower socioeconomic black and Spanish-speaking areas.

Most of the schools were new or nearly new structures with some open or flexible space. They were in areas which stressed increased pupil achievement, with a focus on reading and mathematics, individualizing instruction, non-gradedness, and continuous progress. Thus, IGE complemented many of the goals and objectives of the Chicago public schools.

The appointed IGE/MUS coordinator reported directly to an associate superintendent for instruction in the central office. The coordinator was primarily responsible for planning inservice sessions for these schools, training incoming staff members, and providing liaison between the Chicago Board of Education and the Center. The coordinator maintained direct contact with the Center and kept abreast of the curricular and inservice materials being developed there. In addition to the training received by the coordinator, staff members at each school also received inservice training in the use of Center-developed curricular materials.

The inservice program outlined in the contract required consultant assistance from the Center during the first year of implementation. Center staff consultants were assigned to each school to conduct the required inservice training, monitor the progress of the schools, and provide onsite technical assistance as needed. Their responsibilities included two one-day consultant visits to each of the six pilot centers prior to the opening of school, and two one-day consultant visits to each of the pilot centers to assist principals and staffs during the start of the changeover period.

Five of these six schools were considerably larger than the 400-600 student population used in the prototypic MUS-E (Elementary) organization developed by the Center. The student population ranged from 800 to 1,800; grades included K-3, K-8, 6-8 (for middle schools); and instructional teams ranged from three to ten per building.

The staffing for the four organizational patterns is as follows:

Pattern 1

Primary School (K-3)

800 pupils

25 teachers

5 unit leaders

Administration

1 principal

1 assistant principal

2 school clerks

Kindergarten

1 team leader

6 teachers

2 teaching station aides

Primary 1-3

4 team leaders

19 teachers

4 teaching station aides

Special Education

1 teacher

Learning Resource Center

1 teacher-librarian

1 clerical aide

1 audiovisual technician

Physical Education

1 teacher

Adjustment-Guidance

1 teacher

Coordinator of Closed Circuit Television
1 teacher

Pattern 2

Elementary School (K-8)

1000 pupils
28 staff teachers
3 special education teachers

Administration
1 principal
1 assistant principal
2 school clerks

Kindergarten
2 teachers
2 classroom aides

Primary 1-Grade 8
26 teachers
8 classroom aides

Special Education
3 teachers

Learning Resource Center
1 teacher-librarian
1 clerical aide
1 audiovisual technician

Physical Education
1.5 teachers

Adjustment-Guidance
1.5 teachers

Pattern 3

Middle School (6-8)

1500 pupils, ages 11-14, enrolled in 5 houses
NOTE: 300 pupils and 2 teaching teams per house

Administration
1 principal
3 school clerks
1 assistant principal for instruction in each of 5 houses

<u>1 team</u>	<u>(10 teams)</u>
1 teaching team leader	(10)
5 teachers	(50)
.5 guidance counselor	(5)
.5 special education teacher	(5)
2 teaching station aides	(20)
.5 clerical aide	(5)

Shared Staff

- 1 assistant principal for instruction in shared facilities
- 1 learning resource center team leader
 - 1 teacher-librarian
 - 1 clerical aide
 - 1 multimedia aide
 - 1 audiovisual technician
- 1 reading laboratory teacher
 - 1 reading laboratory aide
- 1 mathematics laboratory teacher
 - 1 mathematics laboratory aide
- 1 personal typing teacher
- 1 special needs teacher
- 2 art laboratory teachers
- 2 music teachers
- 4 physical education teachers
 - 1 matron for swimming pool
- 2 industrial arts teachers
- 2 homemaking teachers
- 1 foreign language teacher

Supportive Services

- 1 assistant principal for administration and supportive services
- 1 teacher-nurse
- 1 attendance officer
- 1 social worker
- 1 school-community liaison/security aide

Pattern 4

Magnet School (K-8)

1800 pupils, ages 3-14, enrolled in academic program K-8

NOTE: Staffing for Communication Arts Center Program is not included

Administration

- 1 principal
- 2 assistant principals
- 3 school clerks
- 1 transportation coordinator (head child-welfare attendant)

- 1 public information officer (teacher)
- 1 school-community liaison

Teams

- 3 specialists
- 33 team teachers (pre-primary and primary)
- 30 team teachers (intermediate)
- 30 team teachers (upper)
- 6 guidance counselors
- 3 school clerks
- 36 teacher aides/bus attendants (4 per team)
- 9 teacher aides other than bus attendants (1 per team)
- 3 secretarial aides

Shared Staff

- 1 learning resource center team leader (teacher-librarian)
- 1 teacher-librarian
- 1 library clerk
- 1 audiovisual technician for learning resource center
- 1 teacher aide for learning resource center
- 2 art teachers
- 1 art laboratory aide
- 2 music teachers (choral and instrumental)
- 2 physical education teachers
- 1 mathematics laboratory teacher
- 1 mathematics laboratory aide
- 4 science laboratory teachers
- 1 science laboratory and vivarium aide

Supportive Services

- 2 teacher-nurses
- 1 attendance officer
- 1 social worker
- 1 speech therapist
- 1 psychologist

In the three years that followed the opening of the first IGE/MUS pilot schools, two additional IGE schools per year have been added, giving a total of twelve IGE schools--eight middle schools, three elementary schools, and one magnet school.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICTS

Initially the Center staff felt that IGE would expand at a rapid rate in the Chicago public schools; however, this did not occur. The Board of Education used discretionary federal funds to implement the first six schools; consequently, these schools had extra staff and services that other schools did not have. As monies became tight, cuts had to be made and staff, such as assistant principals, special teachers, and especially aides, were cut or not

replaced in the schools. Schools that were interested in implementing IGE were discouraged when they found that they could not have the same staffing patterns and instructional and inservice support that the first generation of IGE schools received. Apparently the Board decided to limit the number of schools, primarily due to lack of financial resources.

Even the role of the coordinator was somewhat restricted. As indicated earlier, this position provided essential support and liaison between the central board and the Center. In the past two years, this role apparently has been diminished in terms of support for the cluster of IGE schools and communication with the Center. The principals considered that their greatest problems were in the areas of needed support staff, especially aides, and refinement-type activities for the schools involved for three or more years. In some of the schools, staff inservice was no longer provided by the central office as it had been in the initial implementation years.

At the same time that some schools were implementing IGE, the curriculum department of the Chicago public schools was developing a commitment to its Continuous Progress--Mastery Learning Program. Thus, the IGE program was no longer a primary focus. The curriculum department had also developed management systems for both reading and mathematics. The reading program is very similar to the management system for reading developed at the Center, the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development (WDRSD).

Since 1968 the Center has maintained close contact and frequent communication with the Chicago area IGE schools. During the summer of 1975, four Center staff members conducted a week-long staff development workshop for approximately 30 principals on Continuous Progress--Mastery Learning. Several IGE concepts and practices were explored with these select principals, and IGE staff development materials were made available for examination.

The Center has left the door open for further implementation of IGE schools in the Chicago system. Within the last year, the Chicago system has undergone a change in administration, a new general superintendent, and a major administrative reorganization. At the time of this writing, our staff has not met with the new superintendent and his staff, but he is very knowledgeable about IGE and the problems of implementing these models. In the fiscal year 1977 budget, plans are made to conduct exploratory meetings with the general superintendent and his staff relative to further implementation of IGE in inner-city schools in Chicago.

CONDITIONS IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

In 1971 and 1972, the Center awarded the State of Illinois a cash grant to implement IGE statewide, and a state IGE coordinator was appointed to coordinate these efforts. By the end of 1974, 103 IGE schools had been implemented. However, none of these funds were used to implement IGE in the Chicago public schools.

By legislation (the Otis Act) the Chicago public schools operate under different statutes than the rest of the school systems within the state. Rather than work cooperatively with the state education agency, the Chicago school system entered into a separate agreement with the Center to provide staff development and inservice training for the first six IGE schools implemented in the Chicago Public School System.

In 1972, a group of superintendents, principals, and teachers involved in IGE met and formed the Illinois IGE Leadership Council (IILC). The objective of this group was to form a state IGE forum to lobby for support from the state education agency and teacher education institutions. The IILC ran staff development workshops and drive-in inservice conferences, and provided much-needed leadership for IGE until the state IGE network was formed with financial assistance from the Sears-Roebuck Foundation IGE Teacher Education Project.

It was not until 1973 that the teacher education institutions began to play a major role in statewide IGE implementation. The state education agency was able to get five large public universities to serve on a task force and later on a training team to assist in providing needed staff development for new schools desirous of implementing IGE. This cooperative arrangement was a result of the establishment of the Illinois State IGE Network.

The Center has attempted on many occasions to get the Chicago IGE schools more involved in the Illinois State IGE Network. The Chicago IGE coordinator has participated on a limited basis with the state IGE network, but has no formal working relationship with the other IGE schools in the state. The Center is continuing its efforts to encourage urban schools to take an active part and become members of the state IGE network.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

IGE has experienced a modest growth in Chicago over the past four and one-half years: from six schools in 1972 to twelve in 1976. When IGE was chosen as an exemplary model nearly five years ago, it was generally thought that the concept would expand at a more rapid pace. It is difficult to analyze the situation with such limited information. One former IGE principal blames the slower growth rate on the central office for not providing more support for the existing IGE school and the higher cost of staffing an IGE school.

The staff pattern and teacher-pupil ratio of the original IGE schools come close to the prototypic model of the Center. Because of the financial situation of the Chicago public schools during the past few years, services and staff have been severely cut in all schools, including model/experimental schools. Other schools within the system that were contemplating implementing IGE became reluctant when they learned that they would not have the same staff numbers as the first generation of IGE schools. The role of the IGE coordinator was also questioned. The Board of Education then refused to adopt any new programs that would cost more money to operate than the existing programs. Thus, IGE was caught in the middle of a financial crisis.

Changes in key administrative positions also had some impact on the growth and implementation of IGE in the system. At this point, with the new superintendent and many other administrative changes, the future of IGE as a viable alternative within the system is in question.

About the same time IGE was being implemented in the system, the curriculum department was implementing the Continuous Progress--Mastery Learning Program. Since this was to be a massive systemwide effort, it received priority over all other programs. Chicago's Continuous Progress--Mastery Learning Program is compatible with IGE; in fact, many of its components are almost identical. In addition, the Center conducted some of the inservice training for principals and key administrators as part of the implementation of that program.

As indicated earlier, the Chicago schools participated on a limited basis in the state IGE network. The coordinator attended a few network meetings when they were held in the Chicago area; however, the Chicago IGE schools missed opportunities to participate in many of the network's staff-development and inservice-training workshops. This could have provided some training on a continuous basis for IGE schools when services were cut due to the financial crisis faced by the Chicago system.

Chicago area teacher education institutions (TEIs) have played a minor role in assisting schools in making the changeover to IGE. Even though some of these TEIs placed student teachers in IGE schools, the TEIs did little to prepare the students for schools that they would work in, nor did they offer graduate level courses primarily designed to meet the needs of IGE school personnel. However, over the past two years some Chicago-area TEI representatives have attended Center-sponsored leadership workshops and related activities. This may portend greater assistance to IGE schools in the future.

In the final analysis, although some personnel from the system continuously participated in the national IGE network, as well as in Center-sponsored workshops, the Chicago system did not take full advantage of the available resources in the state to assist in providing staff development and inservice training to its IGE schools. The Center will continue to encourage the Chicago IGE schools to participate in state IGE network activities and attempt to include the schools in the urban network of IGE schools proposed in the 1977 scope of work.

III

IGE IN THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

INITIAL CONTACTS WITH THE CENTER

In 1971 the Wisconsin Research and Development Center began its IGE implementation efforts in California, entering into an agreement with San Jose State University to establish 20 IGE schools by March 1 of the following year. San Jose State University was given a cash grant to implement and operate these schools. At the same time, schools implementing IGE were encouraged to use Title I, III, and other funds.

The first IGE schools in California were thus located in the San Jose area. Some pilot school legislation in 1972 for an Early Childhood Education Program (State Law 501) allowed for a complete planning effort using the IGE multiunit organization as a schematic rationale.

In the spring of 1971, the principal of one of the Los Angeles Unified School District inner-city schools from Area B, along with several other area educators, visited the Center. While in Madison, they were given a three-day IGE overview and realized that its components were consistent with their own individualization thrust.

On returning to her school, the principal brought in a consultant from San Jose State University to talk to the staff on the concepts of team teaching and multiage grouping. Audiovisual and printed materials were left for the staff to examine and review. Over the summer, the principal and several staff members held daily self-instructional sessions on IGE, utilizing the materials. The following spring, the entire staff voted to implement IGE on a school-wide basis.

In July, a one-day awareness conference conducted by Center staff was held for the staff personnel from the Los Angeles Unified School District, including the Los Angeles inner-city schools planning on fall 1972 implementation of IGE. Later that summer, a three-day Principal-Unit Leader Workshop and a three-day Pre-opening of School Workshop were conducted by Center personnel for the staff of the 111th Street School, the first Los Angeles school to implement the IGE model.

The following year, three more Los Angeles Unified Schools in Area B adopted IGE. The staff inservice sequence was conducted jointly by the Center and the State of California Department of Education, with staff assistance from faculty members of the first IGE schools. Area B appointed an IGE coordinator to oversee staff development and inservice needs.

Within the next two years, six additional schools in the district implemented IGE, bringing the total to ten. By this time, Area B had developed the staff capability to assist in its own inservice program. However, the Center provided the following technical assistance to these schools:

1. Awareness session for Los Angeles Unified School District schools outside Area B in July 1973
2. Principal-Unit Leader Workshops in November 1973, May 1974, and November 1974
3. An Individually Guided Motivation Workshop in May 1974
4. IGE Leadership Workshops in 1974 and 1975
5. Ongoing refinement activities for IGE schools from 1972 to present

After California became one of the 14 original IGE network states, Los Angeles Unified School District schools became active in network activities. In 1974, the principal of the first IGE school in the district was voted president-elect of the Association for Individually Guided Education (AIGE).

During the 1975-76 school year, 10-15 schools began a sequence of inservice activities to implement IGE for the 1976-77 school year. All staff development and inservice was conducted by Area B personnel, with the original IGE principal assuming a leadership role and coordinating these efforts.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE SCHOOLS

IGE was implemented in an inner-city school with a pupil population of nearly 900 and a staff of 40 teachers. As far back as 1969, the staff was committed to individualizing instruction and had a program funded which attempted to package curriculum together for individualization by rate of children's progress. The district had mandated that certain schools individualize instruction and was given some Title I money with which to work. The staff was working with a professor from a nearby college in the curriculum design using learning packages and the diagnostic curriculum model.

The principal indicated that IGE was compatible and had the potential of fulfilling the Early Childhood Education (ECE) requirements (State Law 501). This was the state's new educational policy toward school programs which provide accountable data for student progress, show evidence of a needs assessment for student programming, and have mandated parent participation. Although implementation of IGE was carried out through the leadership of the principal at the school level, it was certainly aided by the policy directive at the state level, and the schools' designation as a pilot model for ECE by the state and district.

The principal had become interested in IGE only after Title I evaluators had finished an evaluation of their individualization-of-instruction efforts in spring 1971. The principal had been working on her own in many of the areas in which IGE had a conceptual basis, e.g., team teaching, a diagnostic curriculum, continuous progress, and breakdown of the age-graded pattern.

After successful school-wide implementation of IGE, the school added three curricular components researched and developed at the Center: (1) the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development (WDRSD), (2) Individually Guided Motivation (IGM), and (3) Developing Mathematical Processes (DMP). Through the use of Title I monies, consultants were brought in periodically to review the IGE implementation process and offer suggestions.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICTS

The Los Angeles Unified School District is one of the largest school districts in the country. Discussion of the trends and operations of the city system are rather meaningless for a case study of one elementary school except for its level of support systems. The city system supports innovations, and has been interested in individualizing instruction since the late 1960s.

During the 1960s, the city system reorganized its school system from a "downtown"-oriented central bureaucracy to 13 quasi-autonomous school districts structured around high school attendance areas. Individualization of instruction has been pushed through the school district (Area B) since 1968 as a means of bringing up children's reading scores and general academic performance.

Teacher militancy does not seem to be much of a factor in the new IGE school, though the Los Angeles Unified School District Teachers Union is certainly a very strong union. However, parents remember the six-week teachers' strike in 1969 as having brought teachers and community into a much closer relationship because the community supported the strike and helped tutor children once it was over.

The Area B superintendent was very supportive of IGE and had attended the first IGE Awareness Conference held in the area. His continued support is viewed as a significant factor in the successful implementation of IGE in other schools within and outside the district. Staff were released whenever possible to attend IGE-related functions, including participation in state IGE network activities. As indicated earlier, a district-level administrator was appointed to coordinate IGE activities on a district-wide basis.

An associate superintendent from the central office of Los Angeles Unified School District also lent his full support to these as well as other innovative efforts. These actions demonstrated to other schools throughout the system, the central office's commitment to IGE.

CONDITIONS IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

The California State Department of Education has lent its support to the district through ECE funding, Titles I and III, and general technical assistance for newly implemented IGE schools. When California became a member of the national IGE network system, it became eligible to receive grants from the University of Wisconsin IGE Teacher Education Project, as well as continued technical assistance from the Center. A part-time state IGE coordinator was appointed to coordinate IGE activities throughout the state and to serve as a liaison between the State Department of Education and the Center.

Several state universities and colleges cooperated with the Center in the push for state-wide implementation after 1971. Numerous teacher educators were offered stipends from the Center to attend a variety of workshops ranging from implementors to specialized training in curricular components researched and developed at the Center.

Two years ago with supplemental funding from NIE, one of four regional IGE institutes was established at San Jose State University. This was another agency within the facilitative environment which assisted in the IGE implementation efforts.

The state IGE network was the organization under which all state-wide IGE activities were coordinated. Members of the state IGE network have attended

local, regional, and national planning conferences on future IGE implementation efforts. The current State IGE Coordinating Council (SICC) chairperson and the current chairperson for AIGE are from the Los Angeles Unified School District; thus district personnel are taking a leadership role on both the state-wide and the national level.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The implementation of IGE in Los Angeles Unified School District schools has spread from one inner-city school in Area B to ten IGE schools throughout the district in a three-year period. After these successful implementation efforts, 5-10 new schools are scheduled to make a changeover to IGE in the 1976-77 school year.

In recent months, the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of California has sent letters endorsing IGE for its complementarity within ECE guidelines and for providing viable options for the overall improvement in pupil performance. These letters focus upon ECE evaluations in which one of the Los Angeles School District inner-city IGE schools was rated the number-one ECE school in the state of California. In a number of ECE schools in the state, the IGE instructional and organizational framework was a significant factor in the improvement of pupil performance.

Two other key factors contributed directly to the success, spread, and general acceptance of IGE as a facilitative environment that enhances pupils' chances for improved achievement. First is the support and commitment to IGE by the district and central-office administrators. Their continued support has proven to be an invaluable asset to the success of this major innovative effort. Second is the hard work, commitment, and dedication of the staff and principals of IGE schools throughout the system.

The efforts of the first principal to adopt and implement the IGE design and curricular components must be commended. She has been one of the nation's best-known supporters of IGE. Her school has deservedly received national recognition and acclaim for the success of IGE in an inner-city environment. Prior to this, few inner-city schools had successfully implemented IGE. This school has collected achievement data that seemingly demonstrate a successful IGE implementation strategy along with other improved conditions which improve pupil performance.

Los Angeles Unified School District schools are beginning to accept IGE as a viable organizational and instructional strategy to improve the quality of education for all pupils within the system. The Center will continue to provide technical assistance to inner-city urban schools desirous of making a firm commitment to IGE.

It appears that NIE and other funding sources are now willing to spend badly needed financial resources in urban/inner-city areas. Though financial assistance is very scarce these days, local school districts must be willing to reallocate existing resources for staff development and inservice training to help pay the costs of implementing viable, innovative educational changes that have proven potential for increasing educational achievement. Over the past decade, IGE has demonstrated its ability to achieve this goal.

IV

IGE IN THE NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INITIAL CONTACTS WITH THE CENTER

In the spring of 1974, the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning sponsored an IGE Leadership Workshop in Cranston, Rhode Island. Stipends were offered to the 50 participants attending this workshop. One representative from the New York City Board of Education and a representative from Bank Street Teachers College attended this workshop.

The New York City Board of Education representative became the IGE coordinator for the school system. The coordinator conducted a series of meetings with various districts and central office staff, principals, teachers, community board members, and parents. Additional printed information was requested from the Center to be disseminated among these groups; audiovisual materials were loaned by the Center to the coordinator.

When the IGE coordinator called the Center, requesting materials to assist in awareness and commitment activities, a Center representative indicated that since it was in the process of negotiating a subcontract with New York State to establish a state IGE network, New York City was entitled to receive technical assistance in its efforts to implement IGE within the city's schools. It was then agreed that the Center would offer assistance in running an awareness conference for three elementary schools interested in gaining more information about IGE. A Center staff member, a principal from Evanston, Illinois, and a principal and unit leader from Simsbury, Connecticut, assisted the IGE coordinator from New York City in conducting this awareness activity. More than 75 principals and district office staff members attended this, the first in a series of awareness conferences provided for interested district personnel.

Following these awareness conferences which were held in several districts, 10 schools indicated that they would like more information about IGE and its implementation strategy. After a series of meetings, six schools maintained interest. The first workshop for principals and prospective unit leaders was then scheduled for February 1975 for three schools.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE SCHOOLS

The first elementary school to implement IGE had a population of 800 children in the age range from 5 to 12. The school is located in a low socioeconomic area and is comprised of 96 percent black and Puerto Rican children. Achievement scores in both reading and mathematics were far below the national norms; thus, improvement in these two areas was a priority goal for the school and the district.

The faculty could be characterized as young, dedicated, willing to change, and relatively stable for an inner-city school. Existing problems were further

compounded due to the large number of Puerto Rican students, many of whom came from non-English-speaking homes. Bilingual instruction was conducted in compliance with the Aspira Consent Decree which mandated that children must be instructed in their native language.

Prior to the adoption of the IGE model, the school was organized into self-contained departmentalized classrooms. Groups of teachers were involved in some team teaching on their own. The school had adopted individualization as its primary goal two years earlier and was making considerable progress toward individualizing instruction.

After attending an awareness conference, the principal shared information about IGE with the staff. A series of staff inservice meetings was conducted whereby the principal was able to obtain commitment from the staff to implement IGE.

The principal and four designated unit leaders attended the Principal-Unit Leader Workshop. The workshop was staffed with the Center urban implementation specialist, a principal, and a coordinator from a large IGE school in Chicago, Illinois. The workshop gave this group an opportunity to interact with these two experienced IGE practitioners.

This team returned and provided inservice for the remaining staff members over the next four months. Consultative assistance was supplied by the Central Board of Education, the state IGE network, and the Center. Some staff members met voluntarily on their own time over the summer in preparation for the fall changeover to IGE. A Pre-opening of School Workshop was held the week before school officially opened.

A year-long inservice program was planned for the staff in conjunction with the Learning Cooperative, a staff development component of the state educational agency located in New York City. Funds were received from the New York State IGE Network to help defray the cost of inservice. The following were topics for these inservice sessions:

- October -- Identifying Pupils' Learning Styles for Individualized Teaching
- November -- Organizing Classrooms for Individualizing Instruction
- December -- Improving Team Building Skills
- January -- Techniques for Pupil Assessment
- February -- Mainstreaming Students with Special Needs
- March -- Techniques in Reporting Students' Progress in an IGE Setting
- April -- Open
- May -- Evaluating First Year Activities and Planning for the Second Year

As a result of the successful implementation experience, this school was designated as a demonstration site for the district. Several schools have visited and asked questions about IGE and its implementation in an inner-city setting; several other schools in the district have indicated an interest also.

Two other school staffs attended the workshop but were unable to implement the IGE program during the first year. Lack of commitment on the part of the staff and the inability of the building administrator to plan and implement an inservice program for all staff members were the primary causes for the delay.

In one of these two schools, there was serious disagreement between the principal and the staff in regard to what curricular area should be used to adopt the IGE model. The staff was insistent that it should be either reading

or mathematics, while the administrator thought it should be social studies. Finally, the administrator took the position that unless the district office assured him of additional staff and fiscal resources, it would be impossible to adopt such a complex innovation as IGE.

The administrator of the other school was very enthusiastic about the potential of IGE for his staff. This school is a small primary school (K-3) of 275 students. Though the staff was committed to the concept of individualizing instruction, they seemed to fear what they considered the complex instructional and organizational requirements of becoming an IGE school. They also felt that they could not successfully implement IGE without additional instructional or clerical aides, release time for staff inservice with pay, union contractual guidelines, and scheduled planning time within regular school hours. Although the actual implementation scheduled for the 1975-76 school year was not brought off, they did agree to reconsider the matter, if some way could be found to resolve some of their concerns.

During the spring of 1975, more awareness and commitment activities were carried on in additional schools by the IGE coordinator. A Principal-Unit Leader Workshop was conducted during the first week of September for three schools--the junior high school and two community elementary schools.

Of these three, only the junior high implemented the IGE model as an alternative school-within-a-school for the 1975-76 school year. This unit consisted of 6 teachers and 175 students. Consultative assistance was periodically provided throughout the year by the central board, the New York State IGE Network, the Northeast IGE Institute located at Hartford, Connecticut, and the Center. The IGE cluster attended some of the staff inservice provided by the IGE coordinator. As a result of the successful implementation, response from other staff members, and the overwhelming support from the community, the IGE cluster is expected to expand to include more staff and students during the 1976-77 school year.

The staff of the cluster was very pleased with the morale, attitudinal changes, and overall achievement of the students. Some members on the community advisory board have suggested that the entire school adopt the IGE model. The administration is reluctant to move too fast on this proposal, but has agreed to expand the operation for 1976-77 and evaluate the program again at the end of the year.

Aware that they were under the scrutiny of their peers and the community, the staff of the IGE cluster worked extremely hard to make IGE succeed. Their success is amazing considering that a strike delayed the opening of school for several days, personnel changes occurred, and there was less than full support of the administrative staff.

The two community elementary schools did not implement the IGE model during the 1975-76 school year. Changeover was delayed for one year, and during this period staff members were permitted to attend the central board's inservice offerings. These schools, along with several others, are waiting for decisions at the central board and the district level before committing themselves to IGE. Among their many concerns are fiscal and staff resources, aides, curricular materials, release time for planning, and inservice for the staff.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICTS

District 15 had been heavily involved in several projects with a primary

focus on improving both instruction and the curriculum, e.g., Project Redesign, Optional Educational Programs, and Ideas Into Practice--The Learning Cooperative. The director of Optional Educational Programs (OEP) from the Central Board of Education worked very closely with District 15. Through its inservice program, the latest innovations as well as proven educational practices were made available to the staff of this district.

The district's major educational objective was to improve overall achievement results, with special emphasis on reading and mathematics. Considerable inservice had been offered in individualizing instruction, team teaching, learning/teaching styles, pupil assessment, diagnostic-prescriptive learning, the open classroom concept, and new curricular materials.

An IGE coordinator was appointed to facilitate the dissemination of information on IGE. He also coordinated all the IGE inservice training for the districts involved. The coordinator was a trained IGE implementor and liaison between the Center and the Central Board of Education for the New York City schools. He was able to find fiscal support from the New York State IGE Network to conduct staff development activities for New York City schools interested in implementing as well as securing more information about IGE. These efforts were supported by the central board as well as by regional districts.

Technical assistance was also received from the Northeast IGE Institute at the University of Hartford in Hartford, Connecticut. Visitation sites were arranged for district and school staff to visit IGE schools in operation. School personnel from nearby Connecticut schools served as consultants to these interested districts. As a result of the coordinator's linkage with the New York State IGE Network, technical assistance was also received from the Center. Center staff members, as well as practicing IGE administrators, unit leaders, and teachers, served as consultants to these implementation efforts.

Ten to fifteen schools in District 15 plan to implement IGE within the next two years. Trained IGE personnel will assist in conducting inservice for these schools along with staff from the New York State IGE Network and the Center. One school has already been designated as a demonstration site for the IGE project.

Administrators from the central board, district, and school levels met with Center staff members to explore possible funding resources to aid in the further implementation of IGE within District 15. As a part of its stress on urban IGE implementation, the Center will provide some technical assistance during the 1976-77 school year.

CONDITIONS IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

In 1975 New York state became a member of the Center's national IGE network. The Teacher Education Research Center at State University College at Fredonia signed a subcontract with the Center to coordinate state-wide implementation of IGE. The state IGE network provided some funds for staff development and inservice activities for the first group of New York City schools planning to implement IGE. New York City school personnel have limited participation in the state IGE network.

The Regional IGE Institute located at the University of Hartford in Hartford, Connecticut, has also provided some consultative assistance for implementing IGE schools. Two staff members from the Institute at Hartford participated in a series of IGE inservice workshops. Several experienced IGE principals, unit

leaders, and teachers from nearby Connecticut schools have served as consultants to New York City schools. Some of these Connecticut schools also served as visitation sites for New York City personnel.

The state educational agency through its Optional Educational Programs (OEP) provided the impetus to implement IGE in the city's school system. An onsite consultant from OEP coordinated the IGE changeover activities from 1975 to spring 1976. It was primarily through these efforts that IGE gained a foothold in the schools. The OEP staff person was the chief liaison between the Central Board of Education and the Center. Through OEP funds, inservice IGE materials were purchased for use by these schools. Additional inservice materials were loaned to New York City schools from the state IGE network and the Center.

Unfortunately for the New York City schools, they began to implement IGE when most of the funds for national implementation from NIE had already been allocated or even spent. But the New York State IGE Network along with the Center and the Northeast IGE Institute were able to utilize remaining resources to help with implementation efforts.

Unsuccessful attempts were made to involve local teacher education institutions in the implementation efforts. College and university personnel in the New York City area have received some training in IGE concepts and practices along with specific training in the utilization of certain curricular products developed here at the Center.

The Center, plus staff personnel from the city schools, will continue to encourage teacher education institutions to become more involved in the IGE process. Teacher education institutions have the available resources to work effectively with local school personnel. Several teacher education institutions already use some of the IGE schools as clinical or laboratory sites for their teacher education programs. Such schools have the potential of providing an even better experience for future teachers.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Since the Center began working with New York City schools about 18 months ago, considerable noteworthy progress has been made. One elementary school and a unit within a junior high school made the changeover to IGE. During the 1976-77 school year, four more schools and possibly one other will adopt IGE as a total school effort. The central board awarded grants totaling \$10,000 to three school districts to implement IGE. Thus, the central board and local district have committed themselves to providing the limited resources for schools desiring to implement IGE. With this type of backing, other districts are beginning to show more interest in adopting IGE. Key administrative personnel are apparently convinced of the potential for IGE to make a difference in the instructional program for children throughout the system.

The first elementary school to implement IGE serves as a demonstration site for other schools and its staff has conducted inservice for them; thus, schools within the area have a successful urban/inner-city school with which to identify.

In the most recent development, the New York City Central Board of Education, the New York State Department of Education, and the Center are preparing a proposal to NIE to provide funds for maintaining the existing IGE schools and implementing some new ones. The Center, the New York City Central Board's

Division of Educational Planning and Support, and District 15 staff are cooperating in the joint proposal. The agencies are jointly planning an implementation strategy to cover a three-year period beginning 1977. An implementation plan has been developed that should continue the initial city-wide implementation drive.

The Center is providing the technical assistance required to carry out these activities. The overall plan calls for developing IGE expertise at the local level so that the system will not be continually dependent on the Center.

The Center is looking carefully at recent developments in New York City as a possible site for its proposed Urban IGE Center Project. There are indications that this will be a good time to test and evaluate models, and implementation and refinement strategies.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
CONDUCTED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INITIAL CONTACTS WITH THE CENTER

During the Educational Staff Seminar Meeting held at the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning in October 1974, the Center was criticized for its apparent lack of implementing and establishing closer working relationships with the nation's largest urban school districts. At the urging of NIE staff members, the Center began to explore ways of more effectively working with large urban districts.

Although there have been some urban IGE schools started since 1972, mainly in Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, and Toledo, the number is very small when compared with the nearly 2,000 IGE schools implemented nationally. Exploratory meetings were set up with representatives from Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, New York City, and the District of Columbia.

A member of the Educational Staff Seminar team was an administrative intern on leave from the District of Columbia public schools. That representative was very impressed with the IGE models and their potential for improving the quality of education for urban youths in the nation's capital. The Center began initial contact and correspondence with this representative, who acted as a temporary liaison between the District of Columbia schools and the Center.

As a result of this contact, additional correspondence was established with the associate superintendent for instructional services. After two months of attempting to set a date for an awareness conference, the first in a series was scheduled for January 1975, with administrative and instructional staff from the central office and the six regions. Two Center consultants conducted these awareness sessions.

Initial response to the awareness conference was favorable, and it was suggested that additional IGE awareness activities should be conducted with schools in all six regions of the District of Columbia system. During the next month, three awareness sessions were arranged for all interested school personnel. Eight schools expressed a definite interest in finding out more about IGE and in possibly implementing IGE. Center personnel suggested that schools spend one year exploring IGE before making a definite commitment.

Although the associate superintendent appointed his administrative assistant as liaison between the Center and the District of Columbia schools interested in IGE, due to the recent decentralization plan and the complexities of IGE he suggested that further contact and negotiation be conducted with the individual regions rather than through his office. Subsequently, the directors of staff development in the six regions were the actual contact persons. However, of these six directors, only three responded to an inquiry from the Center--Regions I, III, and VI.

In May 1975, the Center urban implementation specialist met with representatives from the Region I office and four principals for a two-day planning session. The IGE summer institute was planned for June 16-20. There were two workshops: (1) a three-day IGE Staff Development Workshop, and (2) a two-day workshop for regional office staff and principals who were to be future IGE implementors. More than sixty participants attended. The institute was conducted by two Center staff members, an IGE principal from Indianapolis, and a unit leader and teacher from Bloomfield, Connecticut. It was an integral part of the commitment phase activities, providing additional information regarding IGE implementation strategy for District of Columbia schools.

Following the workshops, four schools expressed an interest in partially implementing IGE in their schools, even though the Center overall implementation strategy calls for school-wide implementation. The Malcolm X Open Space School agreed to implement IGE in its upper level unit, which consisted of 10 teachers and 275 students. This group was finally split into three smaller units. It was also agreed that the Center would conduct a Pre-opening of School Workshop for the Malcolm X staff and a limited number of others. An experienced IGE principal along with a Center staff member conducted this activity.

Inservice sessions were planned for October, December, and January for schools in Regions I, III, and VI. In Regions III and VI awareness sessions were held for schools wanting more in-depth information about IGE implementation strategies. Although schools expressed a genuine interest, they were reluctant to commit themselves until they had a definite commitment from the central office and the regional offices regarding staff and material resources needed to successfully implement the IGE model.

The District of Columbia was identified as a potential site for an urban IGE center. An exploratory meeting was set up in February to meet with key staff personnel from central office, regional offices, and local teacher education institutions. Participants were asked to respond to a draft of a position paper entitled A Model for Establishing Urban IGE Centers (Walter & Gardner, 1975). Thirty-five participants attended this session.

In March two Center staff members conducted an IGE awareness session for one school in Region III, and consulted with two other schools in Region I. The following month, IGE information was made available to participants at the Bicentennial Educational Exposition sponsored by the District of Columbia public schools. Finally, the scheduled summer IGE workshop had to be cancelled due to uncertain personnel changes within the interested IGE schools and certain policy decisions by the central board regarding planning time and early release of students.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE SCHOOLS

Following the awareness session in Regions I, III, and VI, meetings were held with several principals and representatives from the regional offices. In some instances, site visits were arranged for Center staff to visit schools and answer further inquiries about the potential for implementing IGE. Many of the schools that responded favorably to IGE were already knowledgeable about some of its basic components, e.g., team teaching, individualizing instruction, multiage grouping, objective-based teaching, and criterion-referenced testing. The schools had conducted extensive testing in the areas of reading and mathematics, and each school was focusing on the improvement of achievement scores

in these areas. Extensive attempts had been made to individualize the curricula in several subject areas; thus, individualizing instruction was a priority item within the regions.

The District of Columbia schools had begun an extensive building and remodeling program some years earlier. As a direct result of these efforts, several new open-space and flexible-space buildings had been opened. These new schools were demonstration schools in the sense that they were attempting many innovative educational practices. Training was provided for all school personnel entering the flexible space schools, and a person was appointed to coordinate staff development activities. IGE seemed complementary to the activities of the open-space schools. After examining IGE, staff personnel were in general agreement on its potential to improve their overall instructional efforts.

Some of the conventionally designed schools were also interested in implementing IGE. They too were involved in a wide variety of curricular and instructional changes to improve pupil achievement. However, some of these schools had the erroneous notion that IGE could only work in open-space facilities. The principals also felt that gaining commitment from the entire staff would be extremely difficult, and they in turn were reluctant to adopt such a complex organizational and instructional design on a building-wide basis. As indicated earlier in this paper, these schools favored partial implementation. In fact, several groups of teachers were attempting to implement the IGE model on a unit basis within their individual schools.

On the other hand, these schools were very disappointed in the lack of commitment to these efforts on the part of both the central and regional offices. Another building-level problem making implementation extremely difficult was the uncertainty of staffing due to severe cuts in personnel throughout the system. Teachers with up to ten or more years of experience were being moved around within the system.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICTS

Although several schools expressed a desire to implement IGE, there was never a firm commitment or the support needed for a successful drive for implementation. Several conditions within the District of Columbia public school system apparently made it difficult to gain commitment to the IGE effort. First, there was an internal power struggle to replace the general superintendent of schools. With all the uncertainties revolving around a possible administrative change, no one at either the central or regional office levels was willing to make a commitment. The issue was finally resolved, after months of delay, with the replacement of the general superintendent and the appointment of an interim superintendent.

Even after the interim superintendent was appointed as the general superintendent, no definite commitments were ever made to the implementation of IGE. There was not a single top-level administrator actively supporting the IGE program at the central office level. Although there was verbal support for IGE at the regional level, building-level administrators were hesitant about attempting to gain commitment from their entire staff unless the regional offices would pledge financial and staff resources to the project. Without this level of commitment and any agreement on the part of either the central office or the regional offices to pledge funds to support the effort to implement IGE schools, it became increasingly apparent that the IGE project could not move

ahead. In its financial crisis, the district decided not to reallocate any of its staff development funds to this project.

It also appeared that everyone was waiting for someone at another level to make the decision to proceed. The central office took the position that under the recent decentralization plan, which divided the system into six regions, the decision to implement must be made at the regional level. The regional office was waiting for the individual schools to make the necessary commitment. The schools involved felt that they needed release time for staff inservice, planning time for teachers, para-professional assistance, and a stabilized staff situation prior to implementation.

CONDITIONS IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

In its implementation strategy, the Center was attempting to involve local teacher education institutions. Center staff met with representatives of three institutions serving the District of Columbia schools. Some staff members from these TEIs had received training in IGE concepts and practices. The three institutions agreed in principle to work cooperatively with the District of Columbia schools on a proposed IGE project. They also expressed interest in becoming part of the proposed Urban IGE Center Project. One university had made plans to introduce IGE in some of its undergraduate and graduate education courses. Also, special pilot courses on IGE concepts and practices would be introduced within the coming year.

Additional contact was made with the Advisory and Learning Exchange, a teacher center project partially funded by NIE. This organization had expressed interest in purchasing some of the curricular materials developed at the Center. The Advisory and Learning Exchange provides a wide variety of workshops for District of Columbia teachers and school personnel: open education, art experiences for teachers, learning styles, bilingual-bicultural education, design and construction of instructional materials, mathematics, and early childhood education.

Due to the Center's limited funding and the District of Columbia's limited commitment, the work with the District of Columbia schools has been temporarily interrupted. There are still some staff members wishing to participate if funding could be secured. Several of these schools have requested more information about three of our curricular products: (1) the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development (WDRSD), (2) Pre-reading Skills Program (PRS), and (3) Developing Mathematical Processes (DMP).

The Center is open to future cooperative efforts with the District of Columbia public schools.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The District of Columbia was suggested as a possible site by the NIE program officers. Considering the internal administrative upheaval within the District of Columbia schools, our entry occurred at the least opportune time for effective involvement of higher administrators within the system. The uncertain status of the general superintendent made it impossible to obtain the type and level of commitment needed for a successful implementation effort.

In the District of Columbia there was no organized state IGE network to

call on for needed resources. Also, initially there were no urban IGE schools in close proximity to the District of Columbia. The only IGE schools available for visitation were some of the "exclusive" suburban systems in Virginia and Maryland. On the other hand, these schools gladly opened their doors to visitation from District of Columbia school personnel.

In terms of central and regional office commitment, each appeared to be passing the buck. No one was willing or even in a position to give the support required for school personnel to adopt a program that required fundamental changes in their organizational and instructional programming.

IGE was also being introduced when the system was experiencing the worst financial crisis in its history. Tax levy monies were on the decline while the federal government was cutting back on many of its funded programs. Established programs within the system were already competing for their slice of the "fiscal pie."

Many administrators appeared to be unsure about their authority to make far-reaching decisions about new programs coming into the system. If these newly proposed programs were free and made it possible to pay for additional personnel, then administrators appeared more willing to "buy" into them. Under the decentralized system, rather than the central office arguing to be actively involved, agreements had to be secured at the six regional levels.

There was also an apparent reluctance on the part of curriculum and staff development personnel to be involved with an outside agency at the level that IGE requires. The limited funds for staff development activities had already been allocated for other or existing projects, thus making it almost impossible for schools to use these funds for IGE implementation. If there are already innovative programs in existence, most resources tend to be focused on them, and those in charge seem to fear any new programs that might put an additional drain on limited fiscal and personnel resources.

The associate superintendent for instructional services appointed someone from his staff to act only as liaison between the central office of the District of Columbia schools and the Center. Later the three regions appointed persons in a similar capacity; but only two staff members attended enough staff development activities to be of much assistance to the schools. At the same time, this new responsibility was an add-on to the regular job. No time was definitely set aside for the new role. In fairness, it should be said that these two liaison persons from Regions I and VI met periodically with principals and coordinated IGE staff inservice within their respective regions.

Although some principals indicated a willingness to explore IGE, only two were aggressive enough to attempt to get commitment from the entire staff. In one case, the staff was willing to adopt IGE, until the central board reneged on an earlier agreement that would allow all of the open-space schools to dismiss their children one afternoon per week to give teachers additional planning time. This was an apparent violation of a board policy which required students to be in school a minimum number of hours per week. The teachers objected to this ruling, but the board's position became final. Subsequently, the teachers voted not to attempt any innovative programs that required as much time as IGE.

Thus, the Center was caught in a situation beyond its control. If release time had been given to teachers, two or three schools would have made the change-over to IGE in the fall of 1976. As things stand now, even the unit in the first school to partially implement IGE is having difficulty because of certain personnel changes. Four of the ten teachers involved are scheduled for transfers beginning in September because of budgetary reshuffling. This will probably

prevent adding another unit for the 1976-77 school year.

Earlier in the spring when we were planning the summer workshop (1976), ways were explored to offer teachers a stipend and/or course credit for attending these IGE workshops. Due to limited funds, the Center was unable to offer teachers a stipend. However, many teachers had volunteered much of their personal time at no additional pay to attend workshops after school and during the summer of 1975, thus demonstrating a definite commitment to IGE on the part of the teaching staff.

Negotiations were underway with a teacher education institution to offer course credit for participating teachers. The amount of red tape involved, plus the fact that teachers had selected a time period when the TEI was not in session, made this virtually impossible. The reasons for going to this institution in the first place were that (1) the teachers preferred it over the other institutions in the area, (2) tuition rates were the lowest in the area, and (3) interest in IGE was expressed by some of the faculty members.

Another local teacher education institution had expressed considerable interest in working cooperatively with the Center on the proposed Urban Center Project. Staff members had attended a variety of IGE sponsored workshops on WDRSD, DMP, and IGE implementor training. Members of that staff had extensive training in individualizing instruction and providing inservice programs for District of Columbia school personnel. Coupled with this, a fairly large number of District of Columbia school teachers have graduate degrees and/or are currently enrolled in graduate programs at this university.

Another teacher education institution sent representatives to meet with Center staff and wanted to explore other ways of becoming involved in the project. Of special concern to some of them were WDRSD and DMP.

All three teacher education institutions have existing working relationships with the District of Columbia schools and see the proposed IGE project as having potential for broadening and extending those relationships. Since the Center has already established lines of communication with these teacher education institutions, future working relationships are possible.

In summary, though no IGE schools were implemented in toto, a large number of staff personnel have a sound knowledge base for future implementation of IGE. If basic internal problems could be resolved, the possibility exists for future work with District of Columbia schools, provided either they or the Center could supply start-up funds to initiate the implementation effort. In the Center's r & d utilization proposal that was not funded, three of the six regional superintendents agreed to work cooperatively with the Center. The Center currently has these letters of commitment on file.

As indicated in earlier paragraphs, although the Center did not attain its goal of implementing a specified number of IGE schools, a considerable knowledge base was gained that will be of great assistance in working with larger urban school systems. In the District of Columbia, an invaluable lesson was learned in terms of navigating the system, obtaining commitment at the various levels, discovering where modifications and adaptations had to be made in the implementation strategy, and finding out how to get teacher education institutions and other educational agencies involved. On the other hand, some insights were gained in "what not to do" in larger urban systems. Center staff started talking to the District of Columbia system's staff without adequate financial backing. It was a severe mistake to attempt such a task without the necessary resources--both human and fiscal. Although some teachers volunteered to attend workshops without a stipend, ways should have been found to pay these teachers for their

time. This could have demonstrated to the teacher organization another type of commitment.

Strong support and commitment from key central office and regional office staffs would have helped. If the administration had committed some financial support, and the appointment of a part-time coordinator for the project, they would have demonstrated far more than a mere verbal sanction for the philosophy of IGE.

Without these types of commitment, the proposed project was fighting an uphill battle. Though the Center embarked upon this activity under-staffed and under-financed, understanding about the nature of urban systems was gained for future urban efforts.

VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Given the limited opportunity and success of the Center in working with large urban school systems over the past four years, one of our major goals is to develop a viable strategy for implementing IGE in some of the nation's larger urban school systems. With our most recent experiences in both New York City and the District of Columbia, considerable knowledge was gained that will help us in the refinement of the strategy for urban implementation.

The Center's basic implementation sequence had to be modified as we began to work with large urban systems. From our experiences, we found that regional or state-wide awareness conferences or staff development activities did not attract key administrators from the large urban areas. Awareness conferences and subsequent staff development activities had to be planned specifically for a particular urban system. In two of the four cases cited, Chicago and Los Angeles, contact was made by the system with the Center and contracts were signed to conduct required staff-development and inservice-training activities. Both contracts called for a specified number of schools to be implemented with additional follow-up consultant assistance.

In the larger bureaucratic urban systems, obtaining commitment from key administrators was a longer and far more difficult process than in smaller systems; contacts had to be made at so many different levels. For example, in various cities contacts had to be made with the general superintendent or assistant superintendent for instruction, assistant superintendent for curriculum, director of staff development, regional/district superintendents, curriculum/staff development specialists, principals, teachers, and parent/community representatives.

In some instances it paid off to initiate contacts at the central office level first, proceeding next to district/regional level and then to the local school. Training a cadre of school personnel at various levels in IGE concepts and practices has proven a significant factor in the effort to develop more in-house and onsite capability.

In each of the four case studies, when there was strong support at the central office level IGE continued to grow and spread within the system. As fiscal support was cut back in the past two years, relatively few schools made the changeover to IGE.

It is essential that early in the planning process local teacher education institutions be brought into the planning. Leadership training and assistance should be given to teacher education institutions so that they can begin to integrate IGE concepts and practices into their existing undergraduate teacher preparation programs, as well as their graduate programs.

It is also imperative to maintain contacts and liaison with parent/community groups from the initial contacts to the final negotiations. Assistance from such groups was a key factor in getting support in school districts in New York City.

In Chicago, IGE was a model implemented in exemplary or experimental schools. This program gained widespread visibility for the first two years. However, its priority ranking in terms of fiscal and personnel resources has been reduced in recent years. The additional expense of these schools might have inhibited their future growth and expansion. According to central office figures, it is far more expensive to operate an IGE school than the average schools in the system. Due to the financial crisis which the system is facing, it is apparently difficult to justify these additional expenditures. Coupled with this is a board of education mandate which curtailed all new programs that are more expensive to operate (the staff-pupil ratio).

In Los Angeles, IGE has continued to grow and has the prospect of even greater growth. Following the legislative enactment of the Early Childhood Education Act, and given the compatibility of IGE with the basic guidelines of the ECE, more schools in California are now looking to IGE as a vehicle to implement these guidelines and secure additional state funding.

New York City is another example of an urban area where, after IGE began to gain support from the central office, more local schools were willing to seriously consider adopting IGE. After nearly two years of involvement with New York City, more interest is beginning to surface. The fact that the central board gave small grants to three school districts to conduct IGE staff development activities is indicative of its support for IGE. Without such support, probably only a couple of schools would have followed through and made the changeover to IGE.

In the District of Columbia public schools, administrative uncertainty appeared to play an important role in the decline of interest in IGE. Initially, contacts were made with key central office and regional office personnel and there was an apparent interest in making IGE information available throughout the system. Following the first scheduled awareness session for key central and regional office staff, additional sessions were planned at the regional level. As local school administrators obtained more information, they began to seriously explore the feasibility of implementing IGE.

About that time, the struggle between the Board of Education and the general superintendent became intensified. The superintendent was finally fired and an interim superintendent was named. With all this uncertainty, few were willing to accept the leadership role required at the central or regional level for IGE to gain commitment and support within the system. Apparently, most key administrators adopted the "wait and see" approach.

While all this was happening, some powerful community groups and regional administrators were also involved in a policy interpretation of board regulation on the length of the school day. Some of the experimental schools were allowed to restructure the school day so that children could be dismissed early one afternoon per week and teachers could have inservice training. When the issue was finally resolved, the board ruled the schools were in violation of board policy by dismissing students for one-half day per week for inservice training. Some schools were about to begin the IGE changeover activities, thinking that they could utilize the half day per week for staff inservice. When the board ruled such actions in violation of board policy, schools voted not to participate in any programs requiring staff inservice on their time without pay. These decisions by both parties halted any possibility of IGE growing within the District of Columbia schools.

Thus, the following factors seemingly influenced the growth and development of IGE in large urban areas:

1. The availability of fiscal and personnel resources, as well as the financial stability of the school system.
2. The amount of resources, both fiscal and personnel, that the Center was able to make available to these systems.
3. The commitment and support of key-level administrators for the innovative ideas espoused by IGE.
4. The compatibility of IGE with other programs within the system, e.g., ECE in Los Angeles and Continuous Progress--Mastery Learning in Chicago.
5. The system's initiative in seeking or buying services from the Center rather than the Center attempting to interest the system in an innovative approach.
6. The stability and tenure of key administrative personnel, e.g., changes in the general superintendent of both Chicago and the District of Columbia.
7. The willingness of teachers and teacher organizations to commit themselves to a long-range staff-development and instructional-improvement program.
8. The support of powerful parent/community groups within the school district(s).
9. The cooperation of teacher education institutions with local schools in providing both inservice and preservice training programs to fulfill the needs of the systems to effectively change over to IGE.

In the final analysis, it appears that any combination of these factors, plus some unanticipated consequences, tend to play a major role in whether or not IGE is established and continues to grow within these urban school systems. When these factors work in favor of innovation or change, IGE tends to flourish. Timing and availability of fiscal and personnel resources appear to be the key factors. One might think that there may be correlation between the financial crisis being faced by many urban systems and the decreased implementation of new innovative educational programs. That appears to be the case in only two of the four school systems studied, Chicago and the District of Columbia.

Finally, as the current financial crisis relaxes a bit, and more federal funds are made available to urban systems, key decision makers may be willing to invest more resources in educational improvement programs. Hopefully as NIE is able to place additional funds at the disposal of laboratories and centers, they will be in a better position to expand their working relationship into large urban school systems. There appears to be some indication that NIE, as well as other federal funding agencies, might make more monies available for research, development, and dissemination of r & d outcomes for the troubled urban schools.

REFERENCE

Walter, J. E., & Gardner, B. A model for establishing urban IGE centers.
Unpublished Working Paper. Madison: Wisconsin Research and
Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1975.

Center Planning and Policy Committee

Richard A. Rossmiller
Center Director

Herbert J. Klausmeier
Area Chairperson
Studies of Cognitive
Learning and Development

Wayne R. Otto
Associate Center Director and
Area Chairperson
Studies in Reading, Language
and Communication Processes

James M. Lipham
Area Chairperson
Studies of Organization
for Instruction and
Administrative Arrangements

Marvin J. Fruth
Area Chairperson
Studies of Individualized
Schooling

Thomas A. Romberg
Area Chairperson
Research on Learning
Processes in Mathematics
and IGE Evaluation

Associated Faculty

Vernon L. Allen
Professor
Psychology

Joseph T. Lawton
Assistant Professor
Child and Family Studies

Thomas S. Popkewitz
Assistant Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

B. Dean Bowles
Professor
Educational Administration

Joel R. Levin
Professor
Educational Psychology

Gary G. Price
Assistant Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Thomas P. Carpenter
Assistant Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

James M. Lipham
Professor
Educational Administration

Thomas A. Romberg
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

W. Patrick Dixon
Assistant Professor
Child and Family Studies

Dominic W. Massaro
Professor
Psychology

Richard A. Rossmiller
Professor
Educational Administration

Marvin J. Fruth
Professor
Educational Administration

Donald M. McIsaac
Professor
Educational Administration

B. Robert Tabachnick
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

John G. Harvey
Professor
Mathematics
Curriculum and Instruction

Gerald Nadler
Professor
Industrial Engineering

J. Fred Weaver
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Frank H. Hooper
Professor
Child and Family Studies

Wayne R. Otto
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Gary G. Wehlage
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Dale D. Johnson
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Penelope L. Peterson
Assistant Professor
Educational Psychology

Herbert J. Klausmeier
V.A.C. Henmon Professor
Educational Psychology

Robert G. Petzold
Professor
Music
Curriculum and Instruction